

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|---|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/769,246 | 01/30/2004 | Lucian H. Lyall III | WILBU.64041 | 8165 |
| 27629 | 7590 03/07/2006 | | EXAMINER | |
| | PATTON LEE & UT | ALEXANDER | ALEXANDER, REGINALD | |
| | 200 OCEANGATE, SUITE 1550 LONG BEACH, CA 90802 | | | PAPER NUMBER |
| LONG BLAC | 7000Z | | 1761 | |
| | | | | |

DATE MAILED: 03/07/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | | Application No. | Applicant(s) | | | |
|--|---|--|---|--|--|--|
| Office Action Summary | | 10/769,246 | LYALL, LUCIAN H. | | | |
| | | Examiner | Art Unit | | | |
| | | Reginald L. Alexander | 1761 | | | |
| | The MAILING DATE of this communication app | ears on the cover sheet with the c | orrespondence address | | | |
| Period fo | • • | | | | | |
| WHIC - Exter after - If NO - Failu Any r | CRTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATES as ions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. Period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period were to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, eply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing and patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). | ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONEI | I. lely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133). | | | |
| Status | | | | | | |
| 1)□ | Responsive to communication(s) filed on | | | | | |
| · — | | action is non-final. | | | | |
| ′= | Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is | | | | | |
| | closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. | | | | | |
| Dispositi | on of Claims | | | | | |
| | Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application. | | | | | |
| - | 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. | | | | | |
| | Claim(s) is/are allowed. | | | | | |
| · | S)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-16</u> is/are rejected. | | | | | |
| 7) | Claim(s) is/are objected to. | | | | | |
| 8)□ | Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or | r election requirement. | | | | |
| Applicati | on Papers | | | | | |
| | The specification is objected to by the Examine | • | | | | |
| 10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on <u>30 January 2004</u> is/are: a)⊠ accepted or b)□ objected to by the Examiner. | | | | | | |
| , | Applicant may not request that any objection to the | | • | | | |
| Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). | | | | | | |
| 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152. | | | | | | |
| Priority u | ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119 | | | | | |
| 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). | | | | | | |
| a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of: | | | | | | |
| 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. | | | | | | |
| 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No | | | | | | |
| 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage | | | | | | |
| application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). | | | | | | |
| * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. | | | | | | |
| • | | | | | | |
| Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) | | | | | | |
| 2) Notic | e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Da | ite | | | |
| | nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) r No(s)/Mail Date <u>1/04</u> . | atent Application (PTO-152) | | | | |

Application/Control Number: 10/769,246

Art Unit: 1761

DETAILED ACTION

Page 2

Drawings

The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the brewing chamber of claim 1 must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

⁽b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-7, 10-13, 15 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Lassota.

There is disclosed in Lassota a brewing apparatus, comprising: a reservoir 30 for heated water; a brewing chamber 24; pluming 32, 38 (spray head); a flow control valve 34 to regulate the flow of heated water; a controller 42 communicating with the flow control valve for opening and closing; a memory 48 accessible by the controller, storing a plurality of pulse brew profiles; selectors 54, 56 operably controlled by a user for choosing a pulse brew profile; wherein the controller polls a temperature sensor sensing a temperature of the infusion liquid in the reservoir, and is responsive to the temperature of the sensor to close the valve (col. 9, lines 50-55).

It should be noted that the operation of the device is dependent upon the maker and user of the device and fails to provide any structure to the claims. All of the structural limitations of the claims have been met by the prior art.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 8 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lassota in view of Lassota et al.

Art Unit: 1761

There is disclosed in Lassota et al. the use of a bypass valve 50 to direct heated water to a beverage collecting member 28.

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to provide the device of

Lassota with the bypass valve disclosed in Lassota et al., in order to dilute the brewed

beverage.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The patent to Bunn et al. is cited for its disclosure of the state of the art.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Reginald L. Alexander whose telephone number is 571-272-1395. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Milton Cano can be reached on 571-272-1398. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/769,246

Art Unit: 1761

Page 5

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

rla March 6, 2006 Reginald L. Alexander Primary Examiner Art Unit 1761